

REMARKS

Summary

Claims 1-5, 7-9 and 12-13 stand in this application. Claims 6 and 11 were previously canceled without prejudice. Claim 10 was previously withdrawn. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the standing claims are respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102

At page 2 of the Office Action claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7-9 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by United States Patent Number (USPN) 6,054,889 to Kobayashi ("Kobayashi"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the cited reference must teach every element of the claim. *See* MPEP § 2131, for example. Applicant submits that Kobayashi fails to teach each and every element recited in claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7-9 and 13 and thus they define over Kobayashi. For example, with respect to claim 1, Kobayashi fails to teach, among other things, the following language:

wherein each third transistor of the first circuit portion is coupled at its base directly to a base of a corresponding third transistor of the second circuit portion, and to a control voltage source.

According to the Office Action, this language is disclosed by Kobayashi at figure 3.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 defines over Kobayashi. Kobayashi at column 5, lines 51-65, in relevant part, states:

The mirror driver 26 includes a pair of transistors Q5a and Q5b while the mirror current driver 28 includes the transistors Q6b and Q6a. The base and emitter terminals of the transistor Q5a are connected to the base and emitter terminals of the transistor Q5b, respectively, while their respective isolated collective terminals are electrically connected to the emitters of the transistors Q.sub.1e, Q.sub.1Ae and Q.sub.2e, Q.sub.2Ae respectively, providing the isolating currents to the first multi-tanh doublet 22. Similarly, the base and emitter terminals of the transistors Q6a are connected to the base and emitter terminals of the transistor Q6b while respective isolated collector terminals are electrically connected to the emitters of the transistors Q.sub.3e, Q.sub.3Ae and Q.sub.4e, Q.sub.4Ae, respectively, providing the isolated current sources to the multi-tanh doublet 24.

By way of contrast, the claimed subject matter teaches “wherein each third transistor of the first circuit portion is coupled at its base directly to a base of a corresponding third transistor of the second circuit portion, and to a control voltage source.” Applicant respectfully submits that this is different than the above recited teaching of Kobayashi.

Applicant respectfully submits, as recited above and as shown in Fig 3 of Kobayashi, that the base of transistor Q5a is connected to the base of transistor Q5b and the base of transistor Q6a is connected to the base of transistor Q6b. Furthermore, transistors Q5a and Q5b are located in the first circuit portion and Q6a and Q6b are located in the second circuit portion of Kobayashi. In contrast, claim 1 states that each third transistor of the first circuit portion is coupled at its base directly to a base of a corresponding third transistor of the second circuit portion.... Applicant respectfully submits that this is clearly different than the teaching of Kobayashi.

Applicant respectfully submits that he has been unable to locate at least the above recited language of independent claim 1 in the teaching of Kobayashi. Consequently, Kobayashi fails to disclose all the elements or features of the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claims 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 13, which depend from claim 1 and, therefore, contain additional features that further distinguish these claims from Kobayashi.

Claim 9 recites features similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is not anticipated and is patentable over Kobayashi for reasons analogous to those presented with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claim 9.

35 U.S.C. § 103

At page 6 of the Office Action claims 2 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi in view of US 3,798,376 to Limberg (“Limberg”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection.

As recited above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 defines over Kobayashi. Applicant submits that Limberg also fails to teach, suggest or disclose the above recited missing language. Moreover, Applicant submits that claims 2 and 12 depend from independent claim 1. Furthermore, if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is non-obvious. *See* MPEP §

2143.03, for example. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claims 2 and 12 that depend from claim 1, and therefore contain additional features that further distinguish these claims from the cited references.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-5, 7-9 and 12-13 recite novel features not shown by the cited references. Further, Applicant submits that the above-recited novel features provide new and unexpected results not recognized by the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims are not anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the cited references.

Applicant does not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to any of the dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant hereby reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the dependent claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

It is believed that claims 1-5, 7-9 and 12-13 are in allowable form. Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Appl. No. 10/621,147
Response Dated May 28, 2008
Reply to Office Action of January 28, 2008

Docket No.: 18065
Examiner: Cavallari, Daniel J.
TC/A.U. 2836

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 724-933-9338 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to the credit card in the previously filed credit card authorization form.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC

/John F. Kacvinsky/

John F. Kacvinsky, Reg. No. 40,040
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Date: May 28, 2008

Tyco Electronics Corporation
4550 New Linden Hill Road, Suite 140
Wilmington, Delaware 19808-2952